



To: Brad Powell, P.E.

From: Jayson Cluff, P.E.

Date: June 25, 2007

Subject: Layton Interchange EIS Traffic Modeling History

Memorandum

---

The Layton Interchange Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) traffic modeling and operations analysis has been an extensive process. The purpose of this memorandum is to outline the key steps that have occurred to arrive at the final results of the traffic study. A more comprehensive description of what has occurred will be provided in the final traffic study report.

The Wasatch Front Regional Council's (WFRC) travel demand model V4.3 was chosen as the primary tool to determine the 2030 traffic demand for the Layton area. At the beginning of the traffic study in June 2006, V4.3 was the latest version of the model. (Note: WFRC has subsequently released V6.0, but it was determined that it was too late in the process to re-do the travel demand modeling and use that version of the model.) The first process in using the model was to validate and update the socio-economic data for Syracuse, Layton and Kaysville that would be used in the model. This demographic data update is documented in the attached memorandum, "Travel Demand Modeling and Traffic Volume Forecasting Methodologies for the Layton I-15 Interchange EIS Project."

Once the socio-economic data update was finalized, the model was run for several alternatives including:

- Base Alternative: Includes the WFRC Long Range Plan minus the Layton 700 South Interchange. This is essentially the "No-Build" alternative.
- Alternative 1: Seven Lanes on 200 North in Kaysville from Legacy Parkway to I-15.
- Alternative 2: Full Interchange at 700 South in Layton.
- Alternative 3: Five Lanes on Gentile Street with a Full Interchange at I-15.
- Alternative 4: Five Lanes on Gentile Street with a Half Interchange at I-15.
- Alternative 5: Improved Hill Field Road, Hill Field Road Interchange, and Gordon Avenue Flyover. This alternative came as a result from public input at the September 26, 2006 open house.

The results of these initial runs of the model showed very little change in travel demand between the alternatives for the major east-west corridors (i.e. Gentile Street, 700 South, 200 North Kaysville, and Hill Field Road). As such, none of the alternatives met the purpose of the EIS which, in part, was to "provide adequate transportation facilities and traffic capacity west of I-15 to relieve existing and projected traffic congestion by providing Level-of-service D or better on Gentile Street."

Horrocks Engineers determined that the traffic analysis zones (TAZ) in the model were too large for the level of detail that was required. The WFRC model was built for regional travel demand forecasting. In order to obtain results on a smaller scale, the TAZ's needed to be split into smaller zones. Therefore a "subarea" model was prepared with smaller TAZ's, and the alternatives were re-run. An analysis of the results showed some improvement in the sensitivity of the travel demand to shift traffic for each of the alternatives. However, the overall results still showed no alternative relieved traffic congestion on Gentile Street.

To determine whether the results of the travel demand model were realistic, Mike Brown was sub-consulted to review the Layton EIS subarea model. Mike Brown was a previous employee of WFRM who helped build the model. He pointed out several issues with the model that may improve the accuracy of the results. The most significant recommendation was to assign more appropriate functional classes to each of the roadways within the study area. The WFRM model is very sensitive to speeds on roadways, which are determined by their functional class. Initially, the roadways were only updated for number of lanes; however, they also should have been updated for functional class such as from a collector to a minor arterial. Other recommendations included to examine the area type and capacity of the roadways to determine whether the model was correctly calculating these values.

After reviewing and updating the roadways in the study area for functional class, capacity, speed, and area type, the subarea model was re-run for each of the alternatives. These new results showed considerable improvement over the previous model runs. In other words, if an alternative had a roadway widening, the new results also showed increased travel demand as would be expected.

At this point, the model and the results were reviewed by the technical advisory committee in early April, 2007. Layton City desired to have additional streets included in the model street network that they had on their Master Street Plan and/or that they thought were significant corridors. The model network was updated to include: 1) 1700 West extension to Gordon Avenue, 2) Marshall Way as a local street, 3) Weaver Lane between Angel Street and Flint Street as a local street, 4) 900 South between Flint Street and the I-15 Southbound On-Ramp, 5) King Street between Gentile Street and Main Street as a collector road.

The model was again re-run for the alternatives and the results were analyzed. Throughout the month of April, 2007, additional improvements and refinements were made to the model which was consequently re-run as required. These refinements included making adjustments to functional classes and speeds to various roadways. The most significant modification was to extend King Street as a five lane roadway southward from Gentile Street to 200 North. Layton City said this improvement was to be added to their Master Street Plan, so in effect the King Street extension was included as a "base" condition for all alternatives. Using these results, Alternatives 1 and 5 were screened out because they did not meet the purpose of the EIS.

During this process, WFRM adopted the V6.0 as the official travel demand model. About the middle of May, 2007, WFRM suggested that switching to the V6.0 model for the Layton EIS was probably not feasible, but they wanted to add the major Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) roads into the Layton V4.3 subarea model. By the end of May, WFRM had updated the Layton V4.3 subarea model to include the latest improvements for I-15 and Legacy Parkway. Initially, the new network resulted in about half the traffic volume on Legacy Parkway that had been shown in previous model runs. In consultation with Ned Hacker, WFRM, it was agreed that Legacy Parkway should be modeled as a 50 mph roadway. The model was again updated and re-run for the remaining alternatives.

These final model runs were used as the 2030 travel demand volumes for the remaining alternatives. Once the daily traffic volumes were determined, the traffic operations analysis was taken a step further to the intersection level. 2030 daily traffic volumes were converted into PM peak hour turning movement volumes. These volumes were analyzed for Gentile Street and 700 South using the *Highway Capacity Manual* methodology in the Synchro software package. A detailed presentation of these results will be shown in the final report.



To: Jim Horrocks, P.E.  
Michael (Kaz) Kaczorowski, UDOT

From: Connie Douglas, E.I.T.  
Ron Mortimer, T.E.  
Mack Christensen, P.E.

Date: February 15, 2007

Memorandum

Subject: Travel Demand Modeling and Traffic Volume Forecasting Methodologies for the Layton I-15 Interchange EIS Project

---

### Introduction

The Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) Conformity Travel Demand Model version 4.3 was used in projecting estimated 2030 traffic volumes/demand throughout the study area for the Layton I-15 Interchange Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) project. The following paragraphs document the processes used to obtain new Davis County demographic data to use in the existing (2005/6) and 2030 travel models, the steps taken in calibrating and validating the model results, and the process in using the 2030 projected travel demand volumes to obtain reliable 2030 forecast traffic volumes.

### Background

In June 2006, Horrocks Engineers began the travel demand modeling process for this project by running an existing 2005/6 travel demand model and a future 2030 demand model. The 2005/6 travel demand model results showed daily travel demand volumes on several roadways in the study area lower than existing traffic count data collected in March 2006. The 2030 travel demand model results were closer to existing traffic data volumes, especially on 200 North. With much growth anticipated in the Syracuse, Layton and Kaysville areas, especially west of I-15 in the project study area, these discrepancies in the travel demand models indicated the need for additional work to improve the travel demand model results.

### Model Validation

Horrocks Engineers met with WFRC and UDOT on June 14, 2006, to further review the 2005/6 and projected 2030 daily travel demand volumes from the initial travel demand modeling performed. WFRC and UDOT requested that Horrocks review the total travel demand growth through the study area through a post processor screen-line adjustor. Checks were also performed with the travel demand models to ensure that the demographic data in the traffic analysis zones (TAZ's) was being regenerated into the correct type of trips and that the trips produced in each TAZ matched the trips assigned through the travel demand model distribution process. After continued evaluation, the post processor screen-line adjustor results and the results of the review of the TAZ trips and distribution processes indicated that the travel demand model was working properly and the growth occurring throughout the study area was considered reasonable. However, the daily travel demand volumes on 200 North and several other roadways in the 2030 model were still closer to existing daily traffic count volumes, not the anticipated volumes the Cities were projecting in their Transportation Master Plans. Horrocks, UDOT, and WFRC concluded that further evaluation of the demographic data for the TAZ's for the cities of Layton, Syracuse, and Kaysville within the project study area was warranted.

### Model Demographic Data Updates

Horrocks Engineers met with the cities of Syracuse and Layton on June 30, 2006, and with Kaysville City on July 7, 2006, to review the demographic data assigned to the TAZ's that were in their city boundaries. The results of the two meetings were that all three cities felt they had substantial growth occurring in several TAZ's that was not reflected in the demographic data assigned to that zone. Syracuse City offered to send GIS shape files to Horrocks for further review of existing and future land use plans. Layton City agreed to review their GIS files, update each TAZ

accordingly, and resubmit the data to Horrocks (received August 30, 2006). In the meeting with Kaysville City, Horrocks received verbal changes to two TAZ's west of I-15, TAZ 257 and 258, with instructions that the remaining city TAZ's demographic data was about what the City had presently or was expected to have by the year 2030. The changes to TAZ 257 and 258 included new population and household values.

After obtaining Syracuse City GIS land use shape files, Horrocks staff re-calculated growth for Syracuse City by merging each WFRC TAZ GIS shape file with the City GIS files and holding the City anticipated 2030 population and household total values. The process of evaluating the GIS files included the following assumptions:

- 45% of non-residential areas were buildable, and the remaining 55% was assigned as open space, roadway infrastructure, and parking lot or other type facilities.
- 43% of residential areas were buildable, based on lot size and estimated total number of units made by Syracuse City. The remaining 57% of the total area assigned to the residential land use was assumed open space (yard), roadway infrastructure, and other type facilities.
- Large agriculture areas of greater than one (1) acre were assigned one (1) single-family household and two (2) employees.

After applying the assumptions to each piece of land use with the City GIS shape files, the amount of land available for building construction was calculated. It was assumed that large parcels of Agricultural property had one or two homes built on them, but primarily the property consisted of farmland and/or fields. Commercial property was assumed to have 19 employees per acre and industrial land uses with 10 employees per acre. Residential land uses were assumed based on Syracuse City standards with zone R-1 having 2.90 dwellings per net acre, R-2 with 3.79 dwellings per net acre, R-3 with 5.44 dwellings per net acre, and R-4 with 14.52 dwellings per net acre. These factors were applied to each piece of land use as they were divided into the different TAZ's with the combined GIS shape files. The factors were used to adjust the household and population values to match Syracuse planning department values of 5,586 households at approximately 3.8 persons per household for a total population of about 21,225 persons for the year 2006. Applying the same factors to again match Syracuse City projections, the estimated households would be about 10,283 for the year 2030. Multiplying the households by about 3.89 persons per household, the 2030 population for Syracuse City was estimated at about 40,000 persons. The employment values for each TAZ were then estimated based on the City projected data and applied to each TAZ with the same proportions as the WFRC demographic data sets used.

The revised demographic data for the three cities (see Appendix A) was then input into the corresponding demographic data files from WFRC. Horrocks re-calculated each Davis County TAZ total while updating the new TAZ totals and holding the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (GOPB) population and employment totals that WFRC uses with their corresponding Conformity models. The 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand models were run again with the new TAZ demographic values for Davis County. The results of the 2005/6 travel demand model with the new demographic data illustrated that daily travel demand volumes on 200 North were more reasonable when compared with existing traffic data counts. The new 2030 travel demand model results were reasonable compared to WFRC and City anticipated projected daily traffic volumes based on the total growth projected to occur for Davis County as a whole as well as for the individual cities.

Horrocks met with WFRC and UDOT on September 6, 2006, to present the results of the revised 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand daily travel demand volumes using the new demographic data values in Davis County. However, WFRC still had concerns that while Horrocks held the GOPB County totals, the City GOPB totals needed to be held as well. WFRC manager, Ned Hacker, requested that the new demographic data files be sent to Scott Festin, also with WFRC, for final review as Scott had been recently updating the 2005 demographic data for the travel demand model files.

Horrocks received final 2005/6 and 2030 demographic data for Davis County from Scott Festin at WFRC on September 12, 2006 (see Appendix B). Scott adjusted the demographic data files for the TAZ's in Davis County

holding both City and County 2005/6 and 2030 GOPB control totals. The new TAZ demographic data was then re-entered into the 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand models, making sure that the new household numbers were adjusted. The household adjustments are necessary with the modeling process and determine the breakdown of how many persons per household are for the homes in each TAZ. This household adjustment is done with the WFRC travel demand model through an internal processor called Gliebe. The Gliebe program must be used to update the persons per household in each TAZ prior to running the new demographic data. If the processor is not used, the trip generation process for the model will continue to use the household values previously determined with the last Gliebe process, hence the household information will not really be updated in the model. Updating the household persons distribution with the Gliebe process then determines how many vehicle trips are assigned to each type household through the auto-ownership assignment in the modeling process, thus making a significant impact on the demand volumes produced.

After adjusting the household demographic data with the Gliebe processor, the 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand models were again run for further evaluation. The results of the new travel demand volumes were similar to the previous runs with the Horrocks adjusted demographic data sets before the data had been reviewed by WFRC. Thus, the new 2005/6 and 2030 demographic data files sent by Scott Festin at WFRC will be used in the modeling for the alternatives evaluation process for this project.

### **Off-Model Adjustments**

Once the travel demand models were validated, it was necessary to convert the travel demand volumes into average daily traffic forecast volumes. As the model validation process had derived reasonable trip generation results, Horrocks decided the travel demand growth between the 2005/6 and 2030 models would provide an accurate measure for projecting the increase in daily traffic volumes for the year 2030. Horrocks used the growth calculated between the 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand model volumes and added to existing traffic counts collected for the project to estimate projected 2030 traffic volumes. With many new roadways planned throughout the study area on the west side of I-15, each roadway was evaluated separately and as part of the regional roadway network in both the 2005/6 and 2030 models. The total growth occurring throughout the study area on similar type roadways was calculated between the two models and off-model adjustments made to re-distribute the growth in travel trips back onto new roadways not in the 2005/6 model. Each individual roadway was evaluated for its type, function, and connectivity to other existing and/or new roadways before off-model volume adjustments were used to estimate the projected 2030 daily traffic volumes for that roadway. It is important with the off-model adjustment process that travel demand model volumes are not taken and applied to the roadway directly as a traffic volume, rather the demand volumes are used strictly in estimating trip growth factors that are applied to existing traffic counts to determine projected future traffic volumes.

### **Forecast Daily Traffic Volumes for I-15**

With new roadway improvements from the Wasatch Front Regional Long Range Plan incorporated into the travel demand model, it is difficult to project for this project 2030 daily traffic volumes on the principal roadways of I-15, the new Legacy Parkway, and the new grade separated US-89 corridor as these roadways are considered to have the same function, servicing faster and longer north-south regional travel demand trips between Weber, Davis and Salt Lake Counties. Thus, while the total north-south travel demand growth in the model is accounted for, the distribution of that demand on the three roadways in the model may not always appear reasonable for smaller, sub-regional projects such as this. However, WFRC, having studied these principal roadways in greater detail, has published projections for the I-15, Legacy, and US-89 corridors based on the function of the corridors and the available travel demand throughout the Davis County region based on existing and projected City growth. Presently, WFRC is estimating that in 2030 the I-15 corridor throughout the project study area will serve about 130,000 to 150,000 vehicles per day (vpd), the new Legacy corridor approximately 22,000 to 30,000 vpd, and the US-89 corridor approximately 67,000 to 83,000 vpd (see Appendix C). These volume ranges have been found to be consistent with the projected travel demand volumes from the Horrocks 2030 travel demand model volumes using the new demographic data sets provided by Scott Festin at WFRC. Therefore, the WFRC projected 2030 traffic volume ranges for the I-15, Legacy and US-89 corridors will be used in the alternatives modeling process for this project.

### **Peer Review Submittal**

It has been agreed upon by all parties and authorities with this Layton I-15 Interchange EIS project that Horrocks Engineers is to submit all of the 2005/6 and 2030 travel demand model data and results to the UDOT Planning department for a final peer review. This memorandum is provided to document the methodologies used by Horrocks and the modeling findings that will be carried forward through the alternatives evaluation process for this project, as well as to document the formal submittal of the traffic data for this project to UDOT. With many environmental studies becoming larger projects for UDOT and engineering consultants, travel demand modeling is becoming a widely recognized tool in evaluating existing and future impacts in regional travel patterns. It would be desirable for WFRC to adopt and incorporate the final demographic data sets from this project into their conformity travel demand model for UDOT and consultants to use on future projects.

Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

---

Cc: file

Charles Mace, UDOT Region One Project Manager  
Walt Steinvorth, UDOT Program Development  
Greg Punske, FHWA  
Eric Rasband, UDOT Planning  
Ned Hacker, WFRC  
Muhammad Faran, WFRC

## APPENDIX A





Table A: TAZ Demographic Data for Syracuse, Layton, and Kaysville Cities Estimated by Horrocks

TAZ	2005/6						2030					
	Population	Households	Total Employment	Retail Employment	Industrial Employment	Other Employment	Population	Households	Total Employment	Retail Employment	Industrial Employment	Other Employment
201	6,589	1,815	310	155	30	125	16,092	4,906	1,106	552	111	443
209	3,946	1,055	232	24	24	184	4,380	1,288	239	23	23	192
210	339	99	114	113	1	0	689	226	140	139	1	0
221	4,567	1,276	7,368	26	52	7,290	5,962	1,846	7,530	26	54	7,450
222	3,415	1,032	537	187	173	178	5,539	1,865	2,238	775	717	746
223	699	244	14	1	1	12	2,324	915	8	1	1	7
224	934	275	12	2	2	9	3,500	1,151	20	2	2	16
225	20	6	462	0	128	334	778	267	1,323	0	364	959
227	2,460	939	1,696	396	14	1,286	2,374	1,032	2,625	613	21	1,991
228	2,046	530	576	0	0	576	3,633	1,035	719	0	0	719
229	4,912	1,411	946	0	30	916	5,562	1,771	1,037	0	33	1,005
230	1,248	438	8,925	68	4,487	4,370	1,280	508	10,714	82	5,387	5,245
232	4,155	2,088	2,752	212	31	2,509	3,771	2,245	4,170	322	47	3,800
233	2,226	964	302	0	302	0	2,232	1,122	502	0	502	0
234	8,161	2,242	682	9	23	650	8,188	2,489	1,162	15	39	1,108
235	1,027	313	43	5	5	33	997	339	96	9	9	77
236	7,010	1,947	602	41	92	469	16,286	5,011	3,333	227	504	2,602
237	5,122	1,451	686	27	7	652	7,085	2,221	1,187	48	13	1,127
238	3,551	911	361	6	108	247	4,668	1,315	1,009	19	300	690
239	6,228	1,759	453	27	329	97	6,455	2,017	722	43	524	154
240	3,899	1,326	1,527	785	47	695	3,548	1,360	2,339	1,202	71	1,066
241	1,260	550	2,436	78	0	2,358	2,113	1,067	3,282	105	0	3,177
242	1,360	581	3,500	2,283	6	1,211	1,212	600	4,500	2,935	7	1,558
243	4,801	1,534	400	17	166	218	4,838	1,734	500	21	206	273
244	7,696	2,257	310	41	14	255	10,995	3,593	400	53	18	328
245	2,188	577	66	11	11	44	5,060	1,471	290	42	41	207
246	1,024	321	30	3	3	24	6,349	2,220	400	36	36	328
247	2,920	809	840	455	0	385	16,164	4,958	1,174	637	0	538
248	1,469	542	3,500	3,096	403	1	1,434	600	4,700	4,158	542	0
249	1,810	620	500	0	0	500	1,813	700	550	0	0	550
250	731	290	1,210	120	25	1,065	898	410	1,800	179	37	1,584
251	3,146	1,210	500	212	10	277	2,838	1,250	600	254	13	333
252	3,614	1,018	150	15	15	120	4,320	1,350	250	25	25	201
253	1,325	392	66	7	7	52	2,115	698	91	8	8	74
254	2,802	824	700	578	122	0	4,186	1,368	1,550	1,280	270	0
255	4,114	1,156	494	11	153	330	4,653	1,445	603	14	186	403
256	2,852	836	153	149	3	1	4,994	1,627	177	173	4	0
257	7,234	1,850	249	116	133	0	18,667	5,244	296	138	159	0
258	3,029	711	905	200	135	569	8,697	2,230	2,940	651	440	1,849
259	2,020	694	1,140	673	203	264	2,067	801	1,827	1,078	325	424
260	4,033	1,241	287	0	0	287	6,112	2,093	342	0	0	342
261	2,371	646	60	30	6	24	4,528	1,364	114	57	11	46
262	1,470	523	1,261	368	80	813	1,711	690	1,469	429	93	947
263	2,393	772	1,024	14	21	989	2,823	1,019	1,030	14	21	995
264	1,781	443	147	0	2	145	2,991	815	175	0	3	172
265	6,770	1,560	215	14	3	198	7,260	1,824	256	17	3	236

## APPENDIX B

Table B: Final TAZ Demographic Data for Davis County from WFRC (TAZ 201 – 251)

TAZ	2005/6						2030					
	Population	Households	Total Employment	Retail Employment	Industrial Employment	Other Employment	Population	Households	Total Employment	Retail Employment	Industrial Employment	Other Employment
201	3,403	983	310	155	30	125	15,282	4,906	1,106	552	111	443
202	808	226	41	4	4	33	973	300	43	4	4	35
203	3,013	997	268	36	0	231	3,628	1,355	349	47	0	302
204	5,033	1,526	589	363	227	0	6,859	2,360	769	474	295	0
205	2,902	1,062	891	506	20	365	2,215	926	843	480	20	343
206	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
207	987	327	188	0	0	188	2,831	1,061	199	0	0	199
208	2,001	595	19	10	10	0	2,503	829	16	8	8	0
209	3,510	983	232	24	24	185	4,159	1,288	239	23	23	192
210	297	34	114	113	1	0	655	226	140	139	1	0
211	1,778	500	43	5	22	16	5,122	1,596	46	4	23	19
212	2,501	785	168	0	60	108	4,643	1,635	299	0	108	191
213	6,127	1,833	164	0	164	0	8,772	2,923	315	0	315	0
214	2,237	846	537	26	0	511	2,151	932	481	23	0	458
215	27	11	7,384	164	75	7,145	32	10	7,550	168	77	7,305
216	994	325	69	7	7	56	1,528	563	74	8	8	59
217	1,689	472	97	49	10	39	2,312	716	103	52	10	41
218	5,217	1,719	395	16	7	372	5,128	1,901	470	20	8	442
219	5,048	1,701	1,816	450	251	1,115	5,016	1,914	2,757	684	381	1,693
220	3,773	1,533	843	70	9	764	3,497	1,651	754	63	8	684
221	4,506	1,148	7,368	26	52	7,290	5,662	1,846	7,926	27	57	7,841
222	2,320	734	537	187	173	178	5,260	1,865	2,238	775	717	746
223	366	133	14	1	1	12	2,207	915	8	1	1	7
224	514	159	12	2	2	9	3,323	1,151	20	2	2	16
225	24	8	462	0	128	334	738	267	1,323	0	364	959
226	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	862	87	431	344
227	2,065	814	1,696	396	14	1,285	2,254	1,032	2,625	613	21	1,991
228	2,300	624	576	0	0	576	3,450	1,035	719	0	0	719
229	4,262	1,281	946	0	30	916	5,281	1,771	1,037	0	33	1,004
230	1,210	66	8,925	68	4,487	4,370	1,216	508	10,714	82	5,387	5,245
231	1,502	573	1,781	134	330	1,317	1,454	687	1,595	120	295	1,180
232	5,500	2,848	2,752	212	31	2,509	3,582	2,245	4,170	322	47	3,801
233	2,635	1,182	302	0	302	0	2,120	1,122	502	0	502	0
234	6,711	1,911	682	9	23	650	7,777	2,489	1,162	15	39	1,108
235	598	190	43	5	5	33	946	339	96	9	9	77
236	3,048	887	602	41	92	469	15,466	5,011	3,333	227	504	2,602
237	5,924	1,756	686	27	7	652	6,728	2,221	1,187	48	13	1,127
238	4,181	1,125	361	6	108	247	4,433	1,315	1,009	19	300	690
239	5,967	1,762	453	27	329	97	6,130	2,017	722	43	525	154
240	4,095	1,453	1,527	785	47	695	3,371	1,360	2,339	1,202	71	1,066
241	2,195	962	2,436	78	0	2,358	2,006	1,067	3,282	105	0	3,177
242	1,269	562	3,500	2,283	6	1,211	1,151	600	4,500	2,935	7	1,558
243	4,418	1,475	400	17	166	218	4,594	1,734	500	21	206	273
244	7,346	2,257	310	41	14	255	10,441	3,593	400	53	18	328
245	1,671	462	66	11	11	44	4,806	1,471	290	41	41	207
246	862	282	30	3	3	24	6,030	2,220	400	35	35	329
247	1,892	549	840	455	0	385	15,350	4,958	1,174	637	0	537
248	1,779	683	3,500	3,096	403	1	1,362	600	4,700	4,158	542	0
249	1,632	583	500	0	0	500	1,722	700	550	0	0	550
250	869	359	1,210	120	25	1,065	853	410	1,800	179	37	1,584

Table B: Final TAZ Demographic Data for Davis County from WFRC (TAZ 251-300)

[illegible]



## APPENDIX C

One West Main Street P.O. Box 377 American Fork, UT 84003 Telephone (801) 763-5100